

**ADOLPH E. COHN, Publisher 1886-1908**  
**OSWALD E. DRYFOOS, Publisher 1901-1912**

**HAROLD F. BARNHART, Executive Vice President**  
**ANDREW FRANKS, Vice President**  
**ROBERT GREENE, Vice President**  
**IVAN VINE, Vice President**  
**FRANCIS A. COX, Secretary-Treasurer**

•

**TURNER CATLEDGE, Executive Editor**  
**JOHN H. OAKES, Editorial Page Editor**

•

**LESLIE MANNIN, Associate Editor**  
**JAMES BENTON, Associate Editor**



5 | 8 | 6 6

## The Segregated City

The greater the progress on the political front in the quest for equality, the more apparent becomes the complicated and stubborn character of the nation's racial problem. Last week brought fresh evidence both of political progress and social stalemate.

In Alabama, Negroes voted in large numbers, many of them for the first time in their lives, in the Democratic primary. The majority of them showed better judgment than did some of their own leaders or their white compatriots. They did not ignore the primary, as some Negro radicals had urged; neither did they vote as a solid racial bloc, as some of their more pragmatic leaders had suggested. The bloc voting was done by the whites who in their unreasoning fear killed the faintly ludicrous gubernatorial candidacy of Mrs. George C. Wallace.

For their part, the majority of Negro voters winced discriminating judgment. Where the issue of racial injustices was clear-cut, they helped defeat segregationists such as Al Lingo in his campaign for Sheriff of Jefferson County (Birmingham) and—though he is disputing the outcome—James G. Clark Jr., the incumbent sheriff in Selma. The police dogs and water hoses of recent years had not been forgotten. But in other counties where Negroes are in the majority, they re-elected white incumbents in preference to their Negro opponents. Fair treatment of past years had also not been forgotten. In short, they acted like more experienced voters elsewhere, choosing on the basis of issues and individual performance and not of monolithic racial solidarity.

But while Negroes in the Deep South voted freely, those elsewhere in the nation still encountered baffling obstacles. Harold Howe 2d, the United States Commissioner of Education, told an audience at Columbia University that the Federal Government had failed in its search for quick solutions to *de facto* school segregation in the North. "Quicksands of legal interpretation" barred the way, Mr. Howe reported. On Capitol Hill, the outlook for the Administration's new civil rights bill was unpromising. Senator Everett Dirksen, the Republican floor leader, denounced a Federal ban on housing discrimination as "unconstitutional."

Meanwhile, the steady outflow of white persons from the cities to the suburbs continues. The New York City Health Department, for example, estimated that between 1960 and 1964, a half-million white persons left New York City and were, in effect, replaced by 400,000 Negroes and Puerto Ricans. Yet the Federal Government's rent subsidy plan, which is the only new program devised to reverse the pattern of housing segregation, ran into fresh opposition in Congress. The House Appropriations Committee deleted the funds for rent subsidies in the budget for the next fiscal year.

Clearly, the American people have not yet faced up squarely to the problem of racial segregation. Northern school segregation arises from segregated neighborhoods. Federal action to outlaw discriminatory practices in housing and a rent subsidy program are only preliminary moves in the major effort needed to crack these walls of apartness.

binding or to expand the membership of the Advisory Board to include qualified people from literature and the arts. The Pulitzer Prizes have been a great and constructive force in American life; their distinction ought not be allowed to diminish.

## C.I.A.'s Congressional Immunity

Congressional supervision of the Central Intelligence Agency is seriously deficient. The 180 resolutions introduced in Congress on this subject over the past two decades reflect a persistent concern. Yet successive Administrations and the C.I.A. itself have blocked approval of all of these resolutions. The latest effort to establish more effective controls over this clandestine infra-government is encountering the same resistance.

Senator Russell and his "Secret Seven"—a Senate subcommittee selected, with C.I.A. screening, from the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees—have just rejected Senator Fulbright's proposal that their group be broadened and revitalized by including three members of the Foreign Relations Committee. This mild but useful proposal was designed to permit closer scrutiny of C.I.A. activities affecting foreign policy without going to the extent of establishing a powerful new monitoring body comparable to the Joint Committee for Atomic Energy.

Tighter control of the C.I.A. by the Administration, the first essential, has been imposed since the Bay of Pigs fiasco. But such control is no substitute for legislative supervision as part of the system of checks and balances of our constitutional government. The latest proof of inadequate control concerns the propriety of the Administration letting C.I.A. analysts present official arguments to American readers in the guise of independent scholarship.

The article on the Vietcong in the current issue of Foreign Affairs by George A. Carver—whose identity as a full-time C.I.A. employee was not disclosed—raises many questions. It is little justification to argue, as the C.I.A. evidently does, that the article was written by Mr. Carver in a private capacity and that the agency merely cleared it for "security." So fine a line of responsibility cannot be drawn in the case of an undercover agency.

The C.I.A., along with the United States Information Agency, is restricted by its charter to overseas activity. It has no business to seek to influence or color domestic opinion. It is one thing for an authorized spokesman of the Government openly to present the evidence for the Administration's contention that the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam is nothing more than an instrument of North Vietnam's Communist party. It is quite another thing for a C.I.A. official to do so, particularly when his identity is not revealed.

Senator Fulbright is on sound ground in asking Admiral Raborn to explain the Carver incident. Beyond this, it is equally necessary to adopt Senator McCarthy's resolution calling for a "full and complete" study of the C.I.A. and its effect on foreign policy by a special subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. Much more Congressional review is needed than the occasional private hearings of the Russell subcommittee.

of America's trouble in the alien world today is simply that it is so rich and powerful. No nation ever had such power to dominate or as little desire or will to dominate, as the United States, but it dominates anyway—invariably, indirectly, and almost absent-mindedly.

The recent cutbacks among our best friends in Canada against our economic influence in that country are the best illustration of the point, though Europe is worried about the same problem. Through investment in Canada, Americans control 60 per cent of the Canadian petroleum industry, 53 per cent of mining and smelting, 35 per cent of paper and pulp, almost all of the Canadian rubber and auto industries.

## The Paradox

Corporate decisions made in the United States about investment, production, and markets affect incentives, initiatives, employment, and the standard of living in Canada.

Most of the time these American decisions help the Canadians. What we do south of the

# Foreign

By C. L. SULZBERGER

**HONG KONG**—Face in the Orient can become a matter of overriding importance, even transcending pragmatic reality. For both the United States and China this is now true of the Vietnam war. Possibly this was not so in 1954 when Secretary Dulles first engaged us in protecting the Southeast Asian status quo or again in 1961 when President Kennedy decided to confront Communist dynamism in Laos and South Vietnam; but it certainly is true today.

### Expulsion Possibilities

Should the United States be defeated or expelled in humiliating circumstances it is evident that no matter how apologists might pretend, there would be changes all over Asia and declining respect for our resolution and the worth of our guarantees. From Japan to India a trend would set in for accommodation with our enemies. Thailand would re-examine its commitments, Asian neutralists would again adore the political East, and Communist fortunes in Indonesia could rise once more in sanguinary retribution.

Intangibles must therefore play a weighty role in American policy considerations and something similar is true for China which has likewise staked immeasurable face on issues

**Observer.**

By **RUSSELL BAKER**

WASHINGTON, May 7—The irony of George Wallace is that, having spent most of his governorship fighting the twentieth century, he is now closing it out with an act of breathtaking progressivism.

This, of course, is his decision

days, both commonly palling. T children b chunes de

**SOMEWHERE**  
Somewhere  
beyond  
A Milook  
the re